Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	**Application No.** 10/578,619	**Applicant(s)** KWON ET AL.	
	Examiner JOSHUA KING	**Art Unit** 2828	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☒ The period for reply expires *3* months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: *1-6 and 9-11*.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Minsun Harvey/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2828

Claim 1 and 9 were amended to overcome the 112 1st paragraph rejection. The 112 1st paragraph rejection has been withdrawn. However, claims 1-6 and 9-11 still stand as rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as is outlined in the final rejection, which was mailed on 12/28/2007. Applicants have also argued that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to the Han reference because Han discloses a 2 dimensional laser and because Han discloses that the modal spacing is proportional to the radius and not inversely proportional as applicants invention. First, the examiner points to page 185 line 4 of the Bae refernce which clearly discloses the modal spacing dependence on the radius of the device. Second the examiner points to Han, which clearly discloses in page 817 column 1 lines 12-18 that a large modal spacing is obtained with a smaller radius. Contrary to applicants assertion this implies that radius and modal spacing are inversely proportional. Finally, the examiner is hereby providing a secondary reference (Wright et al. "Mid-infrared whispering gallery mode ring lasers and LEDS"), to show the actual relationship between modal spacing and radius for ring lasers (page 316 column 1 lines 1-3), which is nearly identical to the modal spacing equation as disclosed by the Bae reference. This reference is merely used as evidence to rebutt applicants arguments. Finally, the laser disclosed by the Han reference is not a 2D ring laser as applicant claims. The resonator has a height, a width, and a length, which makes the device a 3 dimensional resonator (Han reference Fig. 2). Applicants have also argued that since emission wavelengths are different the modal spacing must be different. The examiner notes that emission wavelengths may be different. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would still recognize the importance of radius on modal spacing. Especially, considering the equation on page 185 line 4 of the Bae reference and the Wright reference disclose the wavelength as part of the modal spacing equation.